

REMARKS

Claims 19-21 and 23-44 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-18 and 22 have been previously canceled. Claims 19, 33, 34, 42 and 44 have been amended herein. No new matter has been added. Applicants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and allowance of all pending claims in view of the reasons set forth below.

I. Interview with the Examiner

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of extending an interview on February 19, 2010. During the interview, Applicants' representative discussed possible claim amendments with the Examiner. However, an agreement with respect to the claims was not reached during the interview. Applicants address the rejections provided in the Office Action with the foregoing amendments and following arguments.

II. Objection to Claims

Claims 19-21, 23-33 and 44 are objected to because of formalities.

Regarding claim 19, the Examiner indicates that the recitation of "the memory" should be "memory".

Applicants amend claim 19 to recite "the one or more memory storages".

Regarding claim 44, the Examiner indicates that the recitation of "Java" should be "JAVATM".

Applicants amend claim 44 to recite "JAVATM" as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicants believe that the amendments address the Examiner's concerns. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the objection to claims 19-21, 23-33 and 44.

III. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 19-21 and 23-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The Examiner indicates that in claim 19, the recitation of “a representation of one or more output devices” is not disclosed in the specification.

Applicants amend claims 19 to recite “one or more output devices” as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants accordingly amend claim 34 to recite “one or more output devices” instead of “a representation of one or more output devices”.

The Examiner indicates that in claim 19, the recitation of “one or more storages” is not disclosed in the specification.

Applicants amend claims 19 to recite “one or more memory storages” as suggested by the Examiner.

Applicants believe that the amendments address the Examiner’s concerns. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the § 112 rejection of claims 19-21 and 23-33.

IV. Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 19-21, 27-29, 31, 33-34, 36, and 42-44

Claims 19-21, 27-29, 31, 33-34, 36, and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,256,625 B1 to Breyer et al. (hereafter “Breyer”) in view of U.S. Patent 5,911,066 to Williams et al (hereafter “Williams”) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,593,947 B1 to Ashe et al (hereafter “Ashe”).

1. Claim 19

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *the data server object for posting the data object along with the data object pointer*, as provided in Applicants’ amended claim 19.

In the present application, data is acquired from a data source. The acquired data is encapsulated into a data object. The data object is associated with identification information such as a pointer that indicates the location of the data object in the memory. The data object is then posted on a data server object along with the corresponding pointer. Multiple data sink objects that are interested in using the data object register with the data server object where the data object and the corresponding pointer are posted. The data server provides the pointer to the registered data sink objects so that the data sink objects can share the data object by accessing the data object using the pointer. This way, the present application prevents providing multiple copies of the data object for each data sink object that is interested in the data.

The Examiner asserts that Williams teaches a data server. The Examiner asserts that the data source 1102 is equivalent to the data server recited in Applicants' claim 19. *See Office Action*, page 5, § 12. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Williams discusses transferring data between two computer programs. *See Col. 2*, lines 61-64. Williams uses a uniform data transfer mechanism for the computer programs to transfer data in a uniform manner after a connection is established. *See Col. 5*, lines 54-58. In a cut-and-paste application utilizing the uniform data transfer mechanism, the data source 1102 places a pointer to the data object interface onto a clipboard. Upon invocation of a paste operation, the data sink 1106 accesses the clipboard to retrieve the pointer to the data object interface. *See Col. 15*, lines 25-30. However, Williams is silent about *posting the data object along with the data object pointer* to a data server object.

Applicants submit that claim 19 recites a data source and a data server object. As such, the data source of Williams is not equivalent to the data server object of Applicants' claim 19. In addition, Applicants' claim 19 provides that the data server object [is] for *posting the data object along with the data object pointer*. In contrast, in Williams, the data source 1102 contains the object 1108 and the clipboard 1104 contains a pointer to the object. *See Col. 15*, lines 1-5 and Figure 11. Williams is silent about *posting the data object along with the data object pointer* by the data server object.

Breyer and Ashe does not cure the shortcomings of Williams with respect to *the data server object for posting the data object along with the data object pointer* because Breyer and

Ashe are silent about a data server object. Accordingly, Breyer and Ashe cannot disclose or suggest *the data server object for posting the data object along with the data object pointer*. Hence, Applicants respectfully submit that Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *the data server object for posting the data object along with the data object pointer*, as recited in Applicants' amended claim 19.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Breyer, Williams and Ashe fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 19. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

2. Claims 20-21, 27-29, 31 and 33

Claims 20, 21, 27-29, 31 and 33 depend from amended claim 19 and, as such, incorporate each and every element of amended claim 19. In light of the arguments presented above, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 20, 21, 27, 28, 31 and 33. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 20, 21, 27-29, 31 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

3. Claim 34

Claim 34 recites similar elements to amended claim 19. Specifically, claim 34 recites, among other elements, *posting the data object along with a data object pointer to a data server object*. In light of the arguments presented above for claim 19, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest at least this claim element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

4. Claims 36, 42 and 44

Claims 36, 42 and 43 depend from claim 34 and, as such, incorporate each and every element of claim 34. In light of the arguments presented above, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claims 36, 42 and

43. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 36, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

B. Claims 23-26

Claims 23-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer in view of Williams and Ashe, and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,523,191 to Thomas et al, (hereafter “Thomas”).

As presented above, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest *the data server object for posting the data object along with the data object pointer*, as provided in Applicants’ amended claim 19. Claims 23-26 depend from claim 19 and, as such, incorporate the patentable subject matter of claim 19. Thomas fails at curing the shortcomings of Breyer, Williams and Ashe with regard to at least this claim element.

Thomas does not disclose or suggest *the data server object for posting the data object along with the data object pointer*, as recited in claim 19. Thomas discusses monitoring usage of an electronic device using a client component installed in a client device. A data analysis component determines usage statistics associated with application programs installed on the client device based upon the usage data. The collected data may include measurements of usage time, number of uses, and sequence of usage of specified ones of the application programs. Thomas also discusses monitoring user interaction with a web page downloaded to the client device from a remote location. *See* Col. 2, lines 7-36. However, Thomas is silent about *the data server object for posting the data object along with the data object pointer*, as recited in claim 19.

Breyer, Williams, Ashe and Thomas, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of amended claim 19. Accordingly, claims 23-26 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 23-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

C. Claims 30 and 32

Claims 30 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer, in view of Williams and Ashe, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0041163 A1 to Rhoades et al. (hereinafter “Rhoades”).

As presented above, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest *the data server object for posting the data object along with the data object pointer*, as recited in amended claim 19. Claims 30 and 32 depend from claim 19 and, as such, incorporate the patentable subject matter of claim 19. Rhoades fails at curing the shortcomings of Breyer, Williams and Ashe with regard to at least this claim element.

The sections of Rhoades identified by the Examiner discuss real-time streams of data that can be framed into self contained segments [0127]. Rhoades also discusses that streams of datagrams flow between processors [0132]. Rhoades further discusses forwarding the datagrams as a whole [0151]. Thus, Rhoades does not disclose or suggest *the data server object for posting the data object along with the data object pointer*, as recited in claim 19.

Breyer, Williams, Ashe and Rhoades, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 19. Accordingly, claims 30 and 32 is in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

D. Claims 35 and 37-41

Claims 35, 37-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Breyer, in view of Williams and Ashe, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,823,524 B1 to Hewett, (hereafter “Hewett”).

As presented above, Breyer, Williams and Ashe, alone or in any reasonable combination do not disclose or suggest *posting the data object along with a data object pointer to a data server object*, as recited in claim 34. Claims 35 and 37-41 depend from claim 34 and, as such, incorporate the patentable subject matter of claim 34. Hewett fails at curing the shortcomings of Breyer, Williams and Ashe with regard to at least this claim element.

Hewett is cited by the Examiner to provide teachings for the feature added in claims 35 and 37-41. Hewett discusses managing the distribution of events in a data processing system. Hewett, however, does not disclose or suggest *posting the data object along with a data object pointer to a data server object*, as recited in claim 34.

Breyer, Williams, Ashe and Hewett, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every element of claim 34. Accordingly, claims 35 and 37-41 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 35 and 37-41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the above comments, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance and urge the Examiner to pass the claims to allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-035RCE3. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: April 2, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Neslihan I. Doran/
Neslihan I. Doran
Registration No.: 64,883
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
One Post Office Square
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney/Agent For Applicant